Noname manuscript No.
(will be inserted by the editor)

A construction for directed in-out subgraphs of optimal size

D. Glynn and M. Haythorpe

arXiv:1702.03075v1 [math.CO] 10 Feb 2017

the date of receipt and acceptance should be inserted later

Abstract We describe the concept of a *k-in-out subgraphs*, and provide a construction for k-in-out subgraphs for any positive integer k. We show that our constructions are optimal in the sense that it is impossible to construct a k-in-out subgraph with fewer vertices. For even k, we also prove our construction is edge-optimal.

Keywords Hamiltonian cycles, subgraphs

1 Introduction

Consider a simple, connected, directed graph G of order n. The *Hamiltonian cycle problem* (HCP) is stated as follows: determine if there exists at least one simple cycle of length n in the graph, or not. Such simple cycles of length n are called *Hamiltonian cycles* (HC) and graphs containing at least one HC are called *Hamiltonian*.

In this manuscript, we consider a family of graphs called *in-out subgraphs* which was recently defined in Haythorpe and Johnson [1]. They are referred to as *subgraphs* as their usefulness comes when they are included as part of a larger graph. In-out subgraphs are defined as follows.

Definition 1 Consider a graph S. For some positive integer k, suppose that k of the vertices in S are labelled $i_1, \ldots, i_k$ and called the k *incoming vertices*. In addition, suppose k vertices (possibly overlapping with the previous set of k vertices) in S are labelled $o_1, \ldots, o_k$ and called the k *outgoing vertices*. Then, consider all graphs G satisfying the following conditions.

David Glynn
Flinders University
E-mail: david.glynn@flinders.edu.au

Michael Haythorpe (Corresponding author)
Flinders University, Ph: +61 8 8201 2834, Fax: +61 8 8201 2904
E-mail: michael.haythorpe@flinders.edu.au

1. S is an induced subgraph of G.
2. Any edges going from $G \setminus S$ to S (called *incoming edges*) are incident on one of the incoming vertices.
3. Any edges going from S to $G \setminus S$ (called *outgoing edges*) are incident on one of the outgoing vertices.

Then S is called a *k-in-out subgraph* if, for all such G satisfying the above, and every Hamiltonian cycle H in G, the following is true:

1. H contains precisely one incoming edge and one outgoing edge.
2. If the one incoming edge in H is incident on incoming vertex i_j, then the one outgoing edge contained in H is incident on outgoing vertex o_j.

We refer to the first condition as the *single visit condition* and the second condition as the *paired edges condition*.

Note that another way of thinking of the paired edges condition is that all Hamiltonian paths starting from incoming vertex i_j conclude with outgoing vertex o_j.

The practical effect of an in-out subgraph S is that, from the perspective of HCP, S functions the same way as a vertex within a larger graph G, in that it must be visited precisely once. However, although multiple edges may enter and exit S, once a particular incoming edge is chosen, the set of possible outgoing edges is reduced to only those incident on the corresponding outgoing vertex. Therefore, in-out subgraphs can be used to reduce certain constrained forms of HCP into standard HCP.

For some problems, it is often necessary to replace most or all of the vertices with an in-out subgraph, and hence it is desirable to use in-out subgraphs of small size whenever possible, to prevent the order of the resulting graph from growing too large. In what follows, we present a simple construction which gives a k-in-out subgraph for all positive integers $k \geq 4$, containing $2k-1$ vertices, and prove that this is optimal. The cases when $k = 1, 2, 3$ are handled separately, and contain 1, 3 and 6 vertices respectively.

2 Construction

The construction in this section will produce k-in-out subgraphs of order $2k-1$. First, we prove that it is impossible to construct in-out subgraphs of smaller order.

Proposition 1 *Every k-in-out subgraph S has order at least $2k-1$.*

Proof. Suppose S has order v. Without loss of generality, it is possible to label the vertices so that incoming vertex $i_1 = 1$, outgoing vertex $o_1 = v$, and there is a path between them traversing vertices $1 \to 2 \to 3 \to \cdots \to v$.

Now, suppose there is some incoming vertex i and some outgoing vertex o such that, with this labelling, o directly precedes i. Then it is clear that it is possible to start at vertex $i_1 = 1$ and proceed in order of the labels until o is reached, and depart S. Then S can be re-entered via vertex i and again, we may proceed in order of the labels until $o_1 = v$ is reached, and depart S. Hence it is possible to find a graph G containing S with a Hamiltonian cycle that contains two incoming and two outgoing edges, which is impossible by Definition 1. Hence, there must not be any outgoing vertex directly proceeded by an incoming vertex.

There are k outgoing vertices in S. One of them (o_1) is labelled v, so no vertex proceeds it. However, for each of the other $k-1$ outgoing vertices, there is a vertex which proceeds it which is now prohibited from being an incoming vertex. Similarly, there are k incoming vertices in S. One of them (i_1) is labelled 1, so no vertex precedes it. However, each of the other $k-1$ incoming vertices must be placed avoiding the $k-1$ prohibited places, as well as avoiding i_1. Hence, at least $2k-1$ vertices are required to place all the incoming vertices. □

Next, we consider a class of bipartite graphs and show that the single visit condition can be easily satisfied by them.

Lemma 1 *Suppose that S is a bipartite graph, that is, its vertex set can be partitioned into $\{V_1, V_2\}$ such that all edges in S are incident on an element from both V_1 and V_2. Furthermore, suppose that $|V_1| = |V_2|+1$, and that every incoming vertex and every outgoing vertex is contained in V_1. Then the single visit condition is satisfied.*

Proof. Since all incoming vertices are in V_1, it is clear that whenever S is entered, a vertex in V_1 is visited. From here, a vertex in V_2 is visited, then a vertex in V_1, and so on until S is departed, which must also occur at a vertex in V_1. Hence it is clear that during this visit, precisely one more vertex from V_1 is visited than from V_2. Hence, if S is visited m times, there must be m more vertices of V_1 visited than those of V_2. However, since $|V_1| = |V_2|+1$, it follows that S must be visited precisely once, and so the single visit condition is satisfied. □

Hence, from Proposition 1 and Lemma 1 it is clear that if a bipartite graph S of order $2k-1$ satisfying the conditions of Lemma 1 also satisfies the paired edges condition, then S is an optimal k-in-out subgraph.

In the case where $k = 1$, S contains a single vertex corresponding to both i_1 and o_1. For $k = 2$, it can be checked that the following suffices: S contains 3 vertices and the directed edges $(1,2),(2,1),(2,3),(3,2)$ with $i_1 = 1$, $i_2 = 3$, $o_1 = 3$, $o_2 = 1$. We will leave the cases where $k = 3$ for later.

We now provide a procedure for constructing such a graph for a general k. Suppose we have a graph which is

For even $k \geq 4$, S contains the following edges:

- Undirected edges $(4i-2, 4i-1)$, $(4i-1, 4i)$ and $(4i, 4i+1)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, \frac{k-2}{2}$.
- Directed edges $(4i-2, 4i+5)$ and $(4i+1, 4i+2)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, \frac{k-4}{2}$.
- Directed edges $(1,2)$, $(2k-6, 2k-1)$, $(2k-3, 2k-2)$, $(2k-2, 1)$, $(2k-2, 5)$, $(2k-1, 2k-2)$.

For odd $k \geq 5$, S contains the following edges:

- Undirected edges $(4i-2, 4i-1)$, $(4i-1, 4i)$ and $(4i, 4i+1)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, \frac{k-1}{2}$.
- Directed edges $(4i-2, 4i+5)$ and $(4i+1, 4i+2)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, \frac{k-3}{2}$.
- Directed edges $(1, 2)$, $(2k-4, 1)$, $(2k-2, 5)$.

In both cases, we define the incoming vertices to be $i_j = 2j - 1$ for $j = 1, \ldots, k$. The outgoing vertices require a bit more care to define. In both cases, we can define the majority of the outgoing vertices as $o_{2j} = 4j + 3$ and $o_{2j+1} = 4j - 3$ for $j = 1, \ldots, \lfloor \frac{k-3}{2} \rfloor$. Then, for the even case, the remaining outgoing vertices yet to be defined are $o_1 = 3$, $o_{k-2} = 2k-1$, $o_{k-1} = 2k-7$, $o_k = 2k-3$. For the odd case, the remaining outgoing vertices yet to be defined are $o_1 = 2k-1$, $o_{k-1} = 3$ and $o_k = 2k-5$.

Theorem 1 *For both the odd and even case, there are no Hamiltonian paths starting at incoming vertex i_j and finishing at any outgoing vertex o_k for $k \neq j$.*

Proof. We present the full proof for the even case here. The proof for the odd case follows from analogous arguments. We will partition the incoming vertices into several categories, namely:

- Incoming vertex i_1
- Incoming vertices i_{2j} for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, \frac{k-4}{2}$
- Incoming vertices i_{2j+1} for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, \frac{k-2}{2}$
- Incoming vertex i_{k-1}
- Incoming vertex i_k

Consider first incoming vertex $i_1 = 1$. Consider a Hamiltonian path P that begins at this vertex and finishes at an outgoing vertex. After P begins at vertex 1, it must proceed to vertex 2, and then there is a choice to proceed either to vertex 3 or 9. Suppose that P proceeds to 3, then it is forced to further proceed to 4 and 5. However, at some stage in the future, P must reach vertex $2k-1$, at which point the only options are to either proceed to vertex 1, or vertex 5. Neither choice is still valid, so we conclude that P must not proceed from 2 to 3. However, since vertex 3 is of degree 2, and P does not proceed from 2 to 3, then P must finish at vertex $3 = o_1$.

Next consider any incoming vertex $i_{2j} = 4j - 1$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, \frac{k-4}{2}$. Consider a Hamiltonian path P that begins at this vertex and finishes at an outgoing vertex. After P begins at vertex $4j-1$, it must proceed to vertex $4j$, or else when that vertex is visited later there will be nowhere to go and P would finish here, which is a contradiction since $4j$ is not an outgoing vertex. Instead, P will go to $4j$ and then continue on to vertices $4j+1$ and $4j+2$. At this point, there is a choice to either proceed to vertices $4j+3$ or $4j+9$. Suppose that P proceeds to $4j+3$, then it is forced to further proceed to vertices $4j+4$ and $4j+5$. However, at some stage in the future, P must reach vertex $4j-2$, at which point the only options are to either proceed to vertex $4j-1$ or $4j+5$. Neither choice is still valid, so we conclude that P must not proceed from $4j+2$ to $4j+3$. However, since vertex $4j+3$ is of degree 2, and P does not proceed from $4j+2$ to $4j+3$, then P must finish at vertex $4j+3 = o_{2j}$.

Next consider any incoming vertex $i_{2j+1} = 4j + 1$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, \frac{k-2}{2}$. Consider a Hamiltonian path P that begins at this vertex and finishes at an outgoing vertex. After P begins at vertex $4j+1$, it must proceed to vertex $4j$, or else when that vertex is visited later there will be nowhere to go and P would finish here, which is a contradiction since $4j$ is not an outgoing vertex. Instead,

P will go to $4j$ and then continue on to vertices $4j-1$ and $4j-2$. However, at some stage in the future, vertex $4j-3$ will be visited. If $j=1$, this is vertex 1 and it can only go to vertex 2 which has already been visited, and so the path must finish here. If $j>1$ then there are two cases to consider. Either vertex $4j-3$ is preceded by $4j-4$, or not. In the latter case, then upon arriving at vertex $4j-3$, vertex $4j-4$ is the only remaining destination, which is then followed by $4j-5$ and $4j-6$, at which point there is nowhere to go. Since $4j-6$ is not an outgoing vertex, this case must not have occurred. Hence, vertex $4j-3$ is preceded by $4j-4$ and so upon arriving at vertex $4j-3$ there is nowhere left to go and P must finish at vertex $4j-3=o_{2j+1}$.

Next consider incoming vertex $i_{k-2}=2k-5$. Consider a Hamiltonian path P that begins at this vertex and finishes at an outgoing vertex. After P begins at vertex $2k-5$, it must proceed to vertex $2k-4$, or else when that vertex is visited later there will be nowhere to go and P would finish here, which is a contradiction since $2k-4$ is not an outgoing vertex. Instead, P will go to $2k-4$ and then continue on to vertices $2k-3$ and $2k-2$. However, at some stage in the future, vertex $2k-1$ will be visited. This vertex can only go to vertex $2k-2$, which has already been visited. Since there is nowhere left to go, P must finish at vertex $2k-1=o_{k-2}$.

Finally, consider incoming vertex $i_k=2k-1$. Consider a Hamiltonian path P that begins at this vertex and finishes at an outgoing vertex. After P begins at vertex $2k-1$ it is forced to visit vertex $2k-2$. At this point, vertex 1 must be visited as it will not be possible to reach 1 otherwise. Then for each subsequent vertex, the same argument can be made: upon visiting vertex j we must visit vertex $j+1$ or else it will be impossible to return later. Hence all remaining vertex are visited, with P finishing at vertex $2k-3=o_k$. □

Proposition 2 *There is a Hamiltonian path in S going between each pair of vertices i_j and o_j for $j=1,\ldots,k$.*

Proof. It suffices to provide the paths. First, for the case where k is even:

From i_1: Starting from 1, go to 2. Then repeat the path $4m+1$ to $4m$ to $4m-1$ to $4m-2$ for $m=2,\ldots,\frac{k-2}{2}$, followed by $2k-1$ to $2k-2$ to 5 to 4 to 3.

From i_{2j} for $j=1,2,\ldots,\frac{k-4}{2}$: Starting from $4j-1$, go to $4j$ to $4j+1$ to $4j+2$. Then repeat the path $4m+1$ to $4m$ to $4m-1$ to $4m-2$ for $m=j+2,j+3,\ldots,\frac{k-2}{2}$, followed by $2k-1$ to $2k-2$ to 1. Then travel in vertex order along $2,3,\ldots,4j-2$. Finally, go to $4j+5$ to $4j+4$ to $4j+3$.

From i_{2j+1} for $j=1,2,\ldots,\frac{k-2}{2}$: Starting from $4j+1$, go to $4j$ to $4j-1$ to $4j-2$. Then repeat the path $4m+1$ to $4m$ to $4m-1$ to $4m-2$ for $m=j+1,j+2,\ldots,\frac{k-2}{2}$, followed by $2k-1$ to $2k-2$ to 1. Then travel in vertex order along $2,3,\ldots,4j-3$.

From i_{k-2}: Starting from $2k-5$, go to $2k-4$ to $2k-3$ to $2k-2$ to 1. Then travel in vertex order along $2,3,\ldots,2k-6$ and finally go to $2k-1$.

From i_k: Starting from $2k-1$, go to $2k-2$ to 1. Then travel in vertex order along $2,3,\ldots,2k-3$.

Next, for the case where k is odd:

From i_1: Simply travel in vertex order along $1,2,\ldots,2k-1$.

From i_{2j} for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, \frac{k-3}{2}$: Starting from $4j-1$, go to $4j$ to $4j+1$ to $4j+2$. Then repeat the path $4m+1$ to $4m$ to $4m-1$ to $4m-2$ for $m = j+2, j+3, \ldots, \frac{k-1}{2}$, followed by 1. Then travel in vertex order along $2, 3, \ldots, 4j-2$. Finally, go to $4j+5$ to $4j+4$ to $4j+3$.

From i_{2j+1} for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, \frac{k-1}{2}$: Starting from $4j+1$, go to $4j$ to $4j-1$ to $4j-2$. Then repeat the path $4m+1$ to $4m$ to $4m-1$ to $4m-2$ for $m = j+1, j+2, \ldots, \frac{k-1}{2}$, followed by 1. Then travel in vertex order along $2, 3, \ldots, 4j-3$.

From i_{k-1}: Starting from $2k-3$, go to $2k-4$ to 1 to 2. Then repeat the path $4m+1$ to $4m$ to $4m-1$ to $m-2$ for $m = 2, \ldots, \frac{k-3}{2}$. Finally, go to $2k-1$ to $2k-2$ to 5 to 4 to 3. □

Theorem 2 *The graph S is a k-in-out subgraph of optimal size.*

Proof. From Lemma 1 it is clear that S satisfies the single visit condition, while from Theorem 1 and Proposition 2 it is clear that S satisfies the paired edges condition. Hence from Definition 1 it follows that S is a k-in-out subgraph. Then, from Proposition 1 we can see that S is of minimal order, completing the proof. □

Next, we consider the number of edges in our construction. For even k, S contains $4k-4$ directed edges, and for odd k, S contains $4k-3$ directed edges. We will now prove that it is not possible to construct a k-in-out subgraph on $2k-1$ vertices with fewer directed edges than $4k-4$ directed edges, implying the even case is edge-minimal.

Theorem 3 *Any k-in-out subgraph S of order $2k-1$ contains at least $4k-4$ directed edges.*

Proof. Suppose that S contains the minimal number of edges. The set of vertices V in S can be partitioned into four subsets as follows. Denote by I the set of incoming vertices which are not also outgoing vertices. Denote by O the set of outgoing vertices which are not also incoming vertices. Denote by B the set of vertices which are both incoming and outgoing vertices. Denote by N the set of vertices which are neither incoming nor outgoing vertices. It is clear that the union of these four sets is equal to V and all are disjoint. We will denote their cardinalities as $a = |I| = |O|$, $b = |B|$ and $c = |N|$. Then, since $a + b = k$ and $2a + b + c = 2k - 1$, it can be seen that $c = b - 1$. Hence the number of vertices in N is one fewer than the number of vertices in B.

The proof will be organised as follows. First, we will consider the case where $a = 0$ and show that this case is trivial, and so we will then restrict attention to the case where $a > 1$. First we will show that no edges can go from O to I. Then we will show that, for any embedding showing a Hamiltonian path in S, the path is made up of segments each separated by a single vertex from N and each containing a single vertex from B. We will then prove that vertices from I and N can only go to vertices from I or B, and similarly, vertices from B and O can only go to vertices from O or N. Then, we will use the paired edge condition to determine the minimal number of edges required.

Consider first the case where $a = 0$, that is, all incoming vertices are also outgoing vertices. Note that this is the case for the construction given in this manuscript. Then $b = k$ and $c = k - 1$. Suppose that S is labelled in order of one of the Hamiltonian paths. We will refer to such a labelling as a *path-labelling*. Consider any two consecutive vertices x and y. It is clear that they cannot both be in B, otherwise it would be possible to start at the initial vertex, travel along the

path to x and depart, then re-enter at y and complete the rest of the path, violating the single visit condition. Hence, the vertices must be ordered starting with a vertex from B, then a vertex from N, then a vertex from B, and so on. Since this must be true for any embedding (ie for all Hamiltonian paths in S) it is obvious that any edges between two vertices in B are unnecessary, and similarly, any edges between two vertices of N are unnecessary. Since S is optimal, none of these edges exist and hence S is bipartite. Now consider any consecutive vertices $x \in N$ and $y \in B$. Since there must be a Hamiltonian path starting from y which travels through x at some point, there must be at least one more edge coming out of x in addition to (x, y). So all vertices in N have out-degree at least 2. Similarly, consider any two consecutive vertices $x \in B$ and $y \in N$. Since there must be a Hamiltonian path which ends at x, after having reached y at some point, there must be at least one more edge going into y in addition to (x, y). So all vertices in N have in-degree at least 2. Since S is bipartite, the set of edges departing vertices in N is disjoint with the set of edges entering vertices in N. Hence, at least 4c = 4k-4 edges are required.

Next, consider the case where $a > 1$. It is clear that $b = c + 1 \geq 1$. Suppose that S is labelled with a path-labelling starting from a vertex in I. Consider any two consecutive vertices x and y. Using an identical argument to the previous paragraph, it is clear that it cannot be the case that $x \in O \cup B$ and $y \in I$. Then consider any vertex $x \in B$. Clearly the vertex which proceeds it must be from $O \cup N$. If that vertex is from O, then the next vertex must also be from $O \cup N$, and so forth. Hence, for any path-labelling of S according to a Hamiltonian path, it must be the case that any two vertices from B have a vertex from N in between them. Since $b = c + 1$, this means that there will be precisely one vertex from N between them. So the vertices in B and N come in alternative order. We will say that, given a path-labelling of S, the graph is divided into *segments* such that each segment contains one vertex from B and any two consecutive segments are separated by a single vertex from N. It is obvious that segments must start with some number (possibly zero) of vertices from I, then a single vertex from B, followed by some number (possibly zero) vertices from O. Since this must be the case for all path-labellings, and S has a minimal number of edges, we can conclude the following:

- Vertices in I can only go to vertices in $I \cup B$.
- Vertices in O can only go to vertices in $O \cup N$.
- Vertices in B can only go to vertices in $O \cup N$.
- Vertices in N can only go to vertices in $I \cup B$.

Now, consider any vertex $y \in I \cup B$ in the drawing of S, except the initial one. It is clear that the vertex x that precedes it will be from $I \cup N$. Then, there must be a Hamiltonian path that begins at y and travels through x at some point, so there must be another edge coming out from x in addition to (x, y). It is obvious that if all vertices $y \in I \cup B$ are considered in this way, then the union of preceding vertices is equal to $I \cup N$. Hence every vertex in $I \cup N$ must have out-degree at least 2 and so we have at least $2a + 2c$ edges here.

Next, consider any vertex $x \in O \cup B$ in the drawing of S, except the final one. It is clear that the vertex y that proceeds it will be from $O \cup N$. Then, there must be a Hamiltonian path that ends at x, after having travelled through y previously. Hence, there must be another edge going to y in addition to (x, y). Since we considered $a + b - 1 = k - 1$ vertices, there are at least $2k - 2$ edges here, and from above, we know that each of these edges must emerge from vertices in $O \cup B$, so they are disjoint with the set of edges considered in the previous paragraph. Hence, there must be at least $2a + 2c + 2k - 2 = 4k - 4$ edges. □

For the odd case, the construction is this manuscript does not quite meet the bound provided by Theorem 3. However, so far no examples of k-in-out subgraphs with $4k-4$ edges have been found for odd k.

The construction provided produces in-out subgraphs which are bipartite, and this is also the case in the constructions for $k=1$ and $k=2$ given earlier. We now show that, in addition to being bipartite, the in-out subgraphs are often also planar. This is certainly the case for $k=1$ and $k=2$. Consider S defined as above for $k \geq 4$.

Proposition 3 *S is a planar graph unless $k = 1 \mod 4$.*

Proof. We will consider separately the case where k is even, and the case where k is odd. Suppose first k is even. It is clear that, for this embedding, the only edge crossings occur between successive sets of three undirected edges, we call these *poles*. This can be avoided by "untwisting" every second pole by effectively turning them upside down. The only potential issue is if there is an even number of poles. In this case, vertex $2k-1$ can be relocated above vertex $2k-2$ to retain planarity. Hence, S is planar if k is even.

Next, consider the case where k is odd. Again, the only edge crossings occur between successive poles, so we can again untwist every second pole. The only issue occurs when there is an even number of poles. Each pole contains four vertices, two of which are incoming (and outgoing) vertices. Since there is an even number of poles, the number of incoming vertices contained in them is a product of four. Finally, there is one additional incoming vertex, so in this case, $k = 1 \mod 4$. □

Obviously, if an planar graph is desired for $k = 1 \mod 4$, a $(k+1)$-in-out subgraph can just be constructed with one of the incoming/outgoing vertices treated as a neutral vertex.

Finally, we consider the remaining case when $k = 3$. Exhaustive search shows that there are no 3-in-out subgraphs on 5 vertices, and hence $k = 3$ is the only case where it is impossible to construct a k-in-out subgraph with $2k-1$ vertices. For $k = 3$, the minimal examples occur for six vertices, and among those, the fewest number of directed edges possible is ten. An example of one such 3-in-out subgraph can be constructed by taking the path graph P_6 on six vertices and adding the directed edges $(1,5)$, $(2,1)$, $(3,2)$, $(5,1)$ and $(6,4)$. Then $i_1 = 1$, $i_2 = 3$ and $i_3 = 6$, while $o_1 = 6$, $o_2 = 4$ and $o_3 = 6$. Note that, like the construction given above, the resulting graph is planar, although it is not bipartite. The smallest bipartite 3-in-out subgraph can be obtained by taking $k = 4$ in the earlier construction and then simply treating one of the incoming/outgoing vertices as a neutral vertex.

References

1. Haythorpe, M., and Johnson, A. Change Ringing and Hamiltonian Cycles : The Search for Erin and Stedman Triples. *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, submitted. Available at: http://arxiv.org/abs/1702.02623